

**Remarks**

Claims 1-29 were pending in the application. Claims 30 and 31 are added hereby. Therefore, claims 1-31 are pending in the application.

The Office Action is a restriction requirement, requesting applicants to choose between group I, claims 1-20, group II, claims 21 and 25-29, and group III, claims 22-24.

Applicants hereby elect group I, with traverse.

New claims 30 and 31 more clearly link claim 21 of group II to groups I and III. More specifically, claim 30 contains substantially the same steps as does claim 15 of group I and claim 31 contains substantially the same steps as does claim 22 of group III.

Thus, it is inappropriate to separate the various groups. Furthermore, since the search required for claim 21 and its dependent claims, 30 and 31, will encompass the all of subject matter that needs to be searched for groups I, II, and III, there is no extra work for the Examiner should all the claims remain in a single application.

Applicant further notes that the addition of the “linking” claims was just to make it clear that the groups are actually linked. Applicant notes that the Office Action’s statement that group III is directed to a footprint design is incorrect. Claim 22 is clearly directed to making a micro lens. Applicant also points out that, as explained in the specification, the “pinning” is achieved by the conformal coating. As indicated in the summary of the invention, the single invention of this application is the use of a conformal coating to contain the material to be flowed to its original footprint, thereby facilitating micro lens formation with a desired shape.

**Conclusion**


It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

If, however, the Examiner still believes that there are unresolved issues, he is invited to call applicant's attorney so that arrangements may be made to discuss and resolve any such issues.

In the event that an extension of time is required for this amendment to be considered timely, and a petition therefor does not otherwise accompany this amendment, any necessary extension of time is hereby petitioned for, and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the appropriate cost of such petition to the **Lucent Technologies Deposit Account No. 12-2325**.

Respectfully,

C. A. Bolle

By   
Eugene J. Rosenthal, Attorney  
Reg. No. 36,658  
732-949-1857

Lucent Technologies Inc.

Date: 6/1/04